UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,683	04/10/2001	Mark E. Rose	2072P	1899

7590	08/28/2006

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP
P.O. Box 51418
Palo Alto, CA   94303

EXAMINER
CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _09 June 2006_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-6,8-18,20-30 and 32-38_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-6, 8-18, 20-30 and 32-38_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _10 April 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

This office action is in response to the correspondence received on June 9, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 13 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims feature the language "scheme://servername/.../basedir;parameters/subdir/.../file.extension." The "..." within the phrase is indefinite and allows for an infinite number of possibilities. Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Levergood et. al. (US Pat. No: 5,708,780), hereafter referred to as Levergood.

1. As to Claim 37, Levergood teaches: A URL ticket for redirecting a URL request

    for a file on a content server from a client to a replica server comprising: A format

    in the a form of: Scheme://servername/.../basedir;parameters/subdir/...

    /file.extension where scheme represents "http" or "https," and the "server name"

    represents a DNS name of a the replica server, and wherein each parameter in

    the URL ticket includes a parameter name and a value:

    Name1=value1;name2=value2;... (see Column 5, line 54).

2. As to Claim 38, Levergood teaches: The parameters include a path parameter, a

    start parameter, a use-by parameter, an end parameter, a uid parameter, a

    clientid parameter, a sessionid parameter, a referrer parameter, and a message

    authentication code (MAC) (see Column 5, lines 56-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-30 and 32-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Levergood et al in view of the FileNet Functionality Sheet.

3. As to claims 1, 13, and 25, Levergood et. al. disclose: In response to receiving a
URL request from a client for a file from the first server, determining if a user of
the client has been granted authorization to access the file (see Column 3, lines
16-21); generating a ticket that includes an identifier identifying the particular file
on the second sever if the user has been granted authorization access (see
Column 3, lines 50-54); creating a redirect URL ticket to the file on the second
server by (i) modifying the client's URL request to identify the second server (see
Column 3, lines 38-42); and (ii) augmenting the URL request with the ticket
authorizing access to the particular file; wherein the redirect URL ticket has the
form: scheme://servername/.../basedir;parameters/subdir/.../file.extension (see
column 2, line 31; column 3, lines 38-43 and lines 50-54); and returning the
redirect URL ticket to the client, such that the client uses the redirect URL to
request the file from the second server (see Column 3, lines 41-43 and Column
7, lines 14-21).

While Levergood et al do teach the use of a document management systems
and multiple servers (see Column 8, 59-61), they do not, specifically teach
allowing a content originator to publish a file on a first server, or specifying user
authorization for a particular file, or file replication. The FileNet Functionality
Sheet, on the other hand, does disclose: allowing a content originator to publish
a file on a first server and to specify what users are authorized to access the file

(see Functionality Sheet, lines 30-35); replicating the file from the first server on a

second server (see Functionality Sheet, lines 56-57).

4. As to claims 2, 14, and 26, Levergood discloses: Verifying the ticket on the

    second server and returning the requested file (see Column 6, lines 5-16).

5. With regards to Claims 3, 15, and 27, Levergood further discloses: The web

    browser has not been customized to request tickets (see Column 4, lines 24-31).

6. With respect to Claims 4, 16, and 28, the FileNet Functionality sheet discloses:

    allowing the content originator to specify what access privileges each user has

    with respect to the files, the access privileges including read, write, and delete

    (see lines 30-35).

7. With regards to Claims 5, 17, and 29, the FileNet Functionality sheet further

    discloses: allowing the access controls to be specified before and after the file is

    replicated onto the second server (see lines 30-35).

8. With respect to Claims 6, 18, and 30, Levergood et al further discloses: storing

    the name of the file in a database along with access privilege specified for the

    file, and when a user makes a request to access the file, looking up the name of

the file in the database and determining if the user has been granted access to
the file (see Column 6, lines 58-67).

9. With respect to Claims 8, 20, and 32, Levergood discloses: Placing into the URL
ticket a path parameter, a start parameter, a use-by parameter, an end
parameter, a uid parameter, a clientid parameter, a sessionid parameter, and
referrer parameter, and a message authentication code (MAC) (see Column 5,
lines 56-65).

10. With respect to Claims 9, 21, and 33, Levergood discloses: Binding a
combination of "basedir+path+sessionid" to an IP address of the client at first use
of the URL ticket (see Column 6, lines 5-8).

11. With respect to Claims 10, 22, and 34, Levergood discloses: Verifying the URL
ticket as valid when: (i) the MAC is correct, (ii) a current time is between values
of the start and use-by parameters, or the "basedir+path+sessionID" combination
has previously been sued for the same IP address, (iii) the
"basedir+path+sessionID" combination has not been used from a different IP
address, and (iv) the URL requests a file that is in a subtree rooted by based
ir+"/"path (see Column 6, lines 5-16).

12. With respect to Claims 11, 23, and 35, Levergood discloses: (i) issuing a transfer ticket from the first server to the client when the first server needs to redirect the client to the second server (see Column 5, lines 49-52 and Column 6, lines 58-67), (ii) recognizing by the second server the transfer ticket in a response from the client (Column 6, lines 5-16), (iii) redirecting the client back to the second server with a URL ticket (see Column 7, lines 14-21), and (v) verifying the ticket on the second server and returning the requested file (Column 6, lines 5-16).

13. With respect to Claims 12, 24, and 36, the FileNet Functionality sheet further discloses: providing a content server as the first server and providing at least one replica server as the second server (see lines 56-57).

14. Levergood discloses an advanced system for controlling access to files across a large network, including multiple users and multiple servers, but not necessarily file replication. FileNet's product is a system for the advanced creation, maintenance, and support of such large system as the one disclosed in Levergood. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Levergood with FileNet's product in order to provide ease of use (see FileNet Functionality Sheet, line 18), system scalability (see FileNet Functionality Sheet, line 21), and high performance (see FileNet Functionality Sheet, lines 14-16).

Response to Remarks

The amendment received on June 9, 2006 has been carefully examined but is not deemed fully persuasive. The applicant contends within the remarks that the prior art does not teach the claimed trait of:

"scheme://servername/.../basedir;parameters/subdir/.../file.extension."

However, a new 112-type rejection has been placed by the examiner due to concerns over the "..." within the claimed trait. The "..." is indefinite and leaves the claim without any limits as to the bounds of the URL structure.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Azizul Choudhury whose telephone number is (571) 272-3909. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AC

JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER